

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-40, 42 and 43 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 13, 22, 29, 34, 42, and 43 have been amended as shown on pages 2-8 of the Reply. It is believed these amendments do not require further search or undue consideration, and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-40 and 42-43 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-40 and 42-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen *et al.* (“Using navigation data to improve IR functions in the context of Web search”, Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management; Atlanta, Georgia, USA, ACM Press – 2001) in view of Chang, *et al.* (“A Multi-Engine Search Tool with Clustering”, 6<sup>th</sup> International World Wide Web Conference, April 1997). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The cited references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every feature of the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (emphasis added).

The claimed invention provides systems and methods that filter and/or rank the search results from a general-purpose search engine in order to exploit the large volume of data available to the search engine and mitigate providing the user with unrelated results. More specifically, it relates to tuning a general-purpose search engine to an entry point for a group of users to exclude information not relevant to the users' search context.

To this end, independent claims 1, 13, 22, 34, 41, 42 and 43 recite similar features namely: ***a tuning component that filters search query results of the general-purpose search engine based at least on the entry point through which the general-purpose search engine was accessed.*** Hansen, *et al.* and Chang, *et al.*, do not teach or suggest such novel aspects.

Hansen, *et al.* discloses a system and methodology to filter and rank results of a general-purpose search engine, by extracting search related navigation information to perform clustering of queries and then ranking the relevant results obtained. Hansen, *et al.* notes “[a] search session, which is a user’s query together with the URLs or the Web pages they visit in response to their query. Implicit in our approach is a form of query clustering that combines similar terms on the basis of Web pages visited during a search” (See Hansen, *et al.* page 135, column 2). Thus, it relates to logging of a query and the results associated with the queries that are further used to filter relevant results for a particular group of users. However, Hansen, *et al.* is silent with regards to a component that identifies an entry point that includes a link utilized to access the general-purpose search engine let alone teach or suggest customizing a general-purpose search engine to the entry point.

Chang, *et al.* discloses a multi-engine search architecture that redirects a received user query to other search engines. The system presents results of clustering to a user which can then be refined by user feedback. Chang, *et al.* notes, “The user can then feedback interested topics to refine the weighting of terms and the query” (See Chang, *et al.* page 5 section 2.5). Thus, it suggests that the results can be filtered on the basis of the feedback provided by the user after the clustering results are provided to the user. However Chang, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest a method by which the results of the general-purpose search engine are filtered based on an entry point that was used to access the search engine.

Applicants’ claimed invention relates to a tuning component that configures a general-purpose search engine for an entry point. It differentiates between a result that is relevant and a result that is non-relevant to a search query context for a group of users who employ the entry point in order to access the general purpose search engine (See Applicants’ specification page 7, lines 14-18). Such claimed aspects provide a general-

purpose search engine that includes the advantages of a specialized search engine because, it provides customized search results based on an identity of the entry point. Hansen, *et al.* either alone or in combination with Chang, *et al* fails to teach or suggest such novel features.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn with respect to independent claims 1, 13, 22, 29, 34, 42, 43 and claims 2-12, 14-21, 23-33, and 35-40 that depend there from.

### **CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP444US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731